

# MUFORG

## BULLETIN

February 1967

### C O M M E N T

The reviews of the BUFORA Annual General Meeting by R.D. Hughes and Paul Hopkins had a rather mixed reception. Some of the points they raised are dealt with in letters published in this issue.

There remain, however, some details to be cleared up. I have noted that some people read the articles literally and took them to be an attack on BUFORA by MUFORG. This is not so. The writers were merely giving their personal impressions of the meeting. During the past year this Bulletin has printed the opinions of contributors and correspondents virtually uncensored. This is simply because it is merely an informal news-sheet which MUFORG members and other recipients use as a platform to air their views as frankly as they wish, on their own responsibility and in their favourite literary styles.

Having attended the BUFORA A.G.M. myself, I must agree with the general opinions of it expressed by Hughes and Hopkins. However, there did not seem to be anything wrong with the organisation of the meeting. Had I written the review I would have criticised the audience. It was painfully obvious that most of them were there for the purpose of reinforcing their uncritical belief in the flying saucers and their alleged denizens. The very air was thick with easy credulity.

I did not agree, though, with every criticism made by our contributors. Like Gilbert's Lord High Executioner, "I've got a little list" of people - ufologists - who "never would be missed," but Nigel Stephenson is not included in it. His talk was the most positive and objective of the meeting. (Whether it was boring or not is not important.) He managed to show us that the basic work of the serious ufologist consists mainly of a routine sifting, sorting and evaluation of basic data. Throughout his talk he continuously, but unobtrusively, emphasized the need for a cold, objective appraisal of the various sightings. Indeed, Nigel Stephenson is one of the dedicated handful of ufologists who keep BUFORA on the rails.

When considering the criticisms of Hughes and Hopkins it should be borne in mind that BUFORA is supposed to be dedicated to the scientific study of the UFO problem. In reality, though, anyone who is willing to fork out the 21/- subscription can become a member and any group of enthusiasts who call themselves a UFO organisation can become affiliated (in actual practice, if not in theory). The result of this is that BUFORA seems to some of us to consist of a handful of talented people wasting their precious spare time pandering to the prejudices of a crowd of armchair ufologists and some notorious cranks.

Those who favour leaving things as they are present two main arguments. Firstly, a large membership is required in order to provide the necessary finance to carry out basic research and investigations. It is also desirable to affiliate with as many local groups as possible in order to get a good coverage of the country to facilitate the collection of basic UFO data. Secondly, supporters of the status quo argue that ufology is such a strange and unusual subject that all shades of opinion and all ideas, however wild they may seem, should be tolerated.

On the other hand, there are the more scientific types who demand that BUFORA's approach to the subject should be - and should be seen to be - rigorously objective and that those who are unable or unwilling to live up to this ideal should be denied recognition and excluded from participation in the affairs of BUFORA.

This sort of controversy is not, of course, new to BUFORA or, indeed, to practically any other UFO organisation. If readers have any ideas as to how UFO organisations in general should be run, what their policy should be and under what conditions people should be accepted as members, I would be pleased to hear about them.

---

#### LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

(Letters intended for publication should be marked "For Publication.")

From: Dr J. CLEARY-BAKER

I am not an aspiring BUFORA bell-wether and I feel that 'BUFORA JOURNAL' serves a more useful purpose as a forum for ideas than it would as a ragbag for every forlorn shred of a UFO report which comes to hand. Sighting reports in bulk are apt to be boring rather than enlightening - as victims of our recent A.G.M. will no doubt agree!

The "temporary membership" nonsense about which Paul Hopkins complains is a legal gimmick forced upon us by circumstances outside our control. We must, however, accept any blame which may be due for a peculiarly dismal function. The whole thing reinforces a contention of mine that the A.G.M. is one meeting which ought to be a charge on BUFORA funds and should not be expected to pay for itself.

With the utmost respect for our friends of CUGIUFO, I feel that they overlooked the fact that many of Britain's veteran UFO-researchers were among the audience at their recent Congress. It is, perhaps, a trifle redundant to lecture such old-stagers on ball-lightning and the like. Also, to CUGIUFO and to MUFORG, I would stress that Dr Hynek's recent observations on "temporal provincialism" in contemporary scientific circles are deserving of attention. Our Vice-President, Mr L. Cramp, has just published a book, "Piece for a Jig-Saw, (Somerton Publishing Co., Cowes, Isle of Wight), which should dispel any doubts as to his suitability to remain one of BUFORA's figureheads. Len is no fool-on-a-march and could certainly run rings around many of his critics.

Scientific method is one thing but scientific dogma, which is, in effect, the exaltation of ephemeral hypotheses to the rank of near-theological articles-of-faith, is another. Young UFO-researchers should not think that even the white-coated godlings of the laboratory know everything yet. There are still a few facts left to be discovered. J. Cleary-Baker, Ph.D., 3 Devenish Road, Weeke, Winchester, Hants.

From: Mr ANDY MAYERS

One way of helping to fill up 12 pages of the MUFORG Bulletin is by printing letters protesting about articles that appeared in previous issues, so I hope you may find room for another letter from this writer.



I wish to take issue with Messrs. Hughes and Hopkins.

I have seen a copy of the A.G.M. Minutes. The Journal issue referred to in your December 1966 Bulletin, top of page 4, was settled. Four Journals will be published each year, quarterly, as at present, with Newsletters being available from G.N.P. Stephenson at a cost of 5/- for 6 issues (plus 6 S.A.E.). This statement agrees with the notes I took on the proceedings.

Like Mr Hopkins, I was somewhat puzzled by the "BUFORA Temporary Membership Card", for one day only, and the signing of the Book, but before having a rave in print like Mr Hopkins, I checked with BUFORA Officials, and found that there was a perfectly reasonable answer. Under the "Conditions of Hire" relating to the Kensington Library no admission charge may be made, but subscriptions may be collected. Hence a Temporary Membership Card in return for a 3/- subscription. Similarly it is a Library rule that all persons entering the Hall must sign their names. The Honorary Secretary of the Association told me that they have no love for this system, so I suggest that Mr Hopkins takes the matter up with the Greater London Council, not the poor old BUFORA Committee!!

The MUFORG Bulletin is, in my opinion, one of the most interesting, amusing, provocative and stimulating UFO publications that I have come across, but please do not spoil it by blatant inaccuracies, and comment based on unchecked facts.

May I close by echoing Messrs. Hughes and Hopkins plea to the BUFORA organisers for a more entertaining programme of lectures after the next A.G.M. Your correspondents were bored, the person next but one to me went to sleep, and I think the chap in front of me did a crossword!! Wake up, everyone. --- Mr Andy Mayers, "Villador," Silverdale Avenue, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey.

From: Mr STEPHEN SMITH, B.A.

Thank you very much indeed for sending me a copy of your Bulletin. I have been impressed by its lively content and congratulate you on such a fine publication.

I was particularly interested to receive your comments on the various meetings held recently under the auspices of BUFORA, and especially the two reviews of the Annual General Meeting by Messrs. Hughes and Hopkins.

Personally I do agree that some of the speakers at the A.G.M. and during the public meeting afterwards did not seem to know when to stop talking and sit down. Like many an artist they spoilt their canvases by overdoing the detailed brush-work. On the other hand I must put into perspective two points raised by your contributors. The irritating affair of asking every member of the audience at our public meetings to sign a visitors book and pay a temporary membership fee is caused by a recent tightening up of the Kensington Library rules that state that only members may be present at meetings and that no admission charge may be made at the door. It is not BUFORA's policy to finance the London meetings from out of the subscriptions of those members living too far from London to come to the meetings; but they have to be financed somehow. Thus to pay for the room-hire we are forced to use the temporary membership device that Mr Hopkins so objects to.

Your other contributor, Mr Hughes, clearly did not follow the Journal debate very closely. The outcome of the discussions was a decision to keep the Journal as a quarterly publication. Of course the Journal of the future will only be as good as the contributions within its pages. If any of your readers in the Merseyside Group have some constructive ideas to put forward for improving the Journal, then please would you, Sir, be so kind as to ask them to send them to the Council Secretary, through their representative on the National Council.

Finally I would like to clear up the matter of the Vice-Presidency. It is probably my fault that your contributor believes that my main objection to the re-election of Mr Cramp to the Vice-

Presidency is his absence from all the BUFORA meetings throughout the past year. This is not so. My main complaint lies with his published work, "Space, Gravity and the Flying Saucer", which consists entirely of a tottering tower of hypotheses, balanced on a foundation of ill-conceived gravitational theory which can be destroyed by the application of some of the simplest ideas on gravitation at present held to be correct. ---- Mr Stephen Smith, B.A., 1a Draycott Road, Wyken, Coventry, Warwickshire.

From: Mr. J. HARNWELL Chairman of MUFORG

At the January 1967 meeting of MUFORG I expressed my feelings about the mode of expression used in certain articles published in this Bulletin recently, and I was not surprised to find that my feelings were shared by other members present at the meeting.

In fairness to other contributors I must mention names. The articles in question were written by Mr D. Hughes and Mr P. Hopkins. Both of these young men are extremely keen and active members whose services are greatly appreciated. I respect their right to criticise but I feel sure that they will now realise that criticism of a facetious and unconstructive nature can have a very damaging effect on human relationships, particularly within an organisation which is in the formative process.

I sincerely hope that all concerned will allow the emotional heat generated in these recent exchanges to die down, so that we may get on with the real work for which this organisation was formed. ---- J. Harnwell

#### PAUL HOPKINS REPLIES

In a recent letter to the Editor, Paul Hopkins defends his style of writing in his usual forthright manner.

He writes: "..... The main issue is my facetious style, well perhaps it is; then perhaps it is written in that style for a purpose. Indeed I do it for a purpose, not for getting kicks I assure you. No, my pen and my style is a weapon that I use time and time again, in order to stir where stirring is needed and to ridicule that which is ridiculous.

No group or ideal is beyond criticism and ridicule, least of all BUFORA and MUFORG for that matter. There is a lot of rot to be cleared and in order that we may clear away the rubbish that is rapidly accumulating one has to strike hard, where it hurts most, using any weapon at hand and this is what I intend to do.

If members of MUFORG do not like this attitude of mine, it only takes a Committee meeting to block all future writings of mine if they don't fit in with the ideals and beliefs of the Group. Though censorship would speak for itself - would it not? I certainly will not change my style, so take it or leave it!"

The Editor certainly has no intention of submitting the Bulletin to censorship and would like to draw the attention of readers to the note on the back page of every issue of the Bulletin which states that all opinions expressed are the responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of MUFORG.

#### THE TW3 OF UFOLOGY

by Jimmy Goddard

Over the last four years of running a small UFO magazine, I have been in the fortunate position of receiving many UFO magazines both from Britain and abroad. But one of them stands out from all the rest as a work of very real talent. If the writers of MUFORG Bulletin had no hand in producing BBC TV's "That Was The Week That Was" then they certainly should have done, for the literary quality of the satire contained within is high.



The magazine seems to be based on a rather strange religion, which states that the human race is both infinitely inferior and infinitely superior at the same time. This strange creed holds that while man is just a collection of substances in a random pattern going nowhere, he still has divine omnipotence in that what a certain section of his community believes at this moment in time to be the correct way of exploring the universe, is of necessity the absolute standard for all time, and fire and brimstone to blasphemers! Dr Cleary Baker summed this up much better than I ever could when he mentioned at the November BUFORA meeting that they believe that "the science of today is the science of eternity."

Of course, I would be the very last person to deny anyone their religion. I have one myself; I believe in God. And, as anyone who knows me will quickly realise, the fact that I was able to utter any words on the BUFORA stage about Sky Scouts or anything else was a miracle, and I am not the type by whom miracles are wrought. Of course, I have no knowledge of who or what gave me the power to speak at the meeting, nor why they should do so for "a long list of mysterious lights (or pies) in the sky." Perhaps if I had been issued with a mathematical brain, seemingly the passport to MUFORG's oracle, I would know, but somehow I doubt it.

However, be that as it may, and for all the literary merit of MUFORG Bulletin, I cannot really see how it is going to help the study of UFOs by running down BUFORA's hard-working Research Officer and the other speakers at the meeting. If nothing else, it threatens to lower the morale of the Association, and that at this time could be dangerous. BUFORA may have its faults, but it was the first organisation in Britain to really get its teeth into the UFO problem, and we could ill afford to lose it. It may be as well to note here that the subject is one which could have direct bearing on all our lives in the very near future. In other words, don't let's hinder. Let's help.

+++++

RECENT NORTH WEST UFO REPORTS ----- None received.

# BOOK REVIEW

PIECE FOR A JIG-SAW by Leonard G. Cramp, M.S.I.A., A.R.Ae.S.  
Somerton Publishing Co. Ltd., Newport Road, Cowes, Isle of Wight  
Price 28/- 388 pp.

Reviewed by Alan W. Sharp, B.Sc., B.Eng., F.R.A.S., F.G.S.

In the Foreword to his book the author says, "Over the last seventeen years or so I have become increasingly convinced that flying saucers, amongst other things, are extraterrestrial spaceships powered by a form of gravitational manipulation (g field) the fundamental concept of which was set out at length in 'Space, Gravity and the Flying Saucer.'

"The dual purpose of this subsequent book is to reconsider the 'G field theory' in terms of more recent sightings and to offer evidence of a mechanical nature for the consideration of both the layman and the technician alike.

"To this I would hasten to add that those who might hope to find the know-how of 'anti-gravity' will not find it in these pages ....."

Your reviewer can vouch for the truth of this statement as he has searched most diligently for some convincing evidence in the book that the manipulation of gravity for flight purposes is a genuine practical possibility.

Unfortunately the requisite evidence has not been forthcoming and the idea appears to be little more than a pious hope supported by a belief that spaceships of extraterrestrial origin are visiting the Earth.

Broadly speaking, Mr Cramp's not inconsiderable volume is divided into two sections.

The first of these examines some physical considerations whilst the second consists of ten analyses of allegedly corroborative evidence.

The book finishes with two chapters entitled respectively "The Bi-field Theory" and "Vindication of a Scout Ship," which do not add much weight to the argument.

It is, of course, quite true to say that many ideas which at one time seemed preposterous have later become accepted as everyday matters of fact and are now firmly established in the ever-growing corpus of systematised knowledge which we call science. Nevertheless one must beware of a too uncritical acceptance of novel theories, even in this age of rapid discovery.

The main objection to the postulate of variable  $G$ , which is implicit in Mr Cramp's theory (p. 116), is that it seems to have no rigorous mathematical or laboratory support and is indeed at variance with what is known about gravity. For example, the value of the constant of gravitation is determinable with fair accuracy in the laboratory (Cavendish and Boys) and is always positive, never negative and is constant within the limits of experimental error, irrespective of the nature of the materials used in the experiment.

When Einstein was developing his theory of gravitation, known as General Relativity, he found that at a certain juncture he had the option of choosing between a positive sign and a negative one. Whichever he chose automatically eliminated the other and he naturally chose to make gravity an attractive force, in accordance with the experimental evidence.

Later, Hoyle and Narlikar obtained similar equations to those of Einstein, but expressed in particulate form, and found that they had no choice at all of sign -- gravity was always an attractive force. Analogies between gravity and magnetism are not very helpful since magnetism is well-known in the laboratory as a bi-polar effect.

It is not sufficient to say, as Mr Cramp does on page 116, "So we assume our space vehicle can generate a field which does not cancel out the Earth's field, but rather opposes it," and "...we will start from the beginning with the premise that our space ship creates such a field in the space around it." Verbal devices of this sort may suffice in the realms of science fiction, but are not science and cannot be considered as adequate premises for drawing valid conclusions about spaceship propulsion.

No field theory has yet been devised to encompass both magnetism and gravitation, despite frequent references in UFO literature to "Einstein's Unified Field Theory" which imply that gravitation has been brought into the fold, as it were, of some all-embracing set of generalised field equations. In point of fact a unified field theory normally affirms the identity of space-time and matter, as suggested by the author on page 116 of his book, and in this connection he apparently rejects Mach's principle, though without going into any detailed discussion of this important aspect of gravitation theory.

Most relativistic cosmologies do satisfy Mach's principle and hence imply that inertia and the value of the gravitational constant are not determined locally, but by matter at a considerable distance, such as that of the most distant meta-galaxies. If this view is correct it follows that the value of  $G$  cannot be significantly affected by purely local events such as are assumed by the postulate of gravity propulsion. In addition it follows that the implications regarding inertia do not encourage a belief in the possibility of isolating passengers from the effects of vehicular acceleration.

In fairness to Mr Cramp it must be said that cosmology is currently in such a low state of health that many of its more far-flung hypotheses are best regarded with extreme caution, not to say scepticism.

Turning now to the evidence it would seem reasonable to consider the matter of surface phenomena and in particular, the so-



called 'craters,' on account of their comparatively non-ephemeral nature. (Chapters 12 and 17) I have no hesitation in saying that those craters for which adequate information is to hand were not caused by the activities of extraterrestrial spaceships, but by considerably more mundane events.

Specifically, the craters at Charlton, Sanquhar, Cockburnspath, Middle Moneynut and Flamborough Head were caused by lightning. The Niton and Berkshire holes were the result of subsidence and the Dufton Fell areas of disturbance were due to the outbreak of sub-surface water following a period of very heavy precipitation.

A great deal of nonsense has been talked about the Charlton occurrence but in point of fact this was a classic example of the type of 'crater' ascribable to the strike of lightning on open ground. It displays radiating surface marks, removal of material and a central hole. It was preceded by a violent thunder-storm accompanied by strong winds and was in an area of considerable storm damage to crops. The lightning struck the ground where there was evidence of a local elevation of the water table and produced detectable magnetic effects in the magnetite-bearing soil, similar to those recorded at Cockburnspath in Scotland.

The strike occurred at a point on a previous field boundary where a large iron straining-post had once been embedded in the ground and secured by metal stays. The disappearance of plants was by no means complete, as had been alleged by one person, according to Mr Bealing, the Shaftesbury photographer whose photographs appeared widely in the Press at the time. Captain Rodgers of the Army investigation team also reported the finding of plant remains at the site.

Regarding some of the other quoted examples of saucer visitations there is little reason to doubt that Captain Mantell died as a result of attempting to climb above the ceiling of his aircraft whilst chasing a large balloon engaged on upper atmosphere research (page 316). The Whidby Island 'contact' case describes an object which appears to have been nothing more mysterious than a small helicopter.

To summarise, then, "Piece for a Jig-Saw" is not a bad purchase at the price even if only to pass a few winter evenings in the realms of science fiction. The rather large amount of pseudo-science which it contains should not be taken too seriously in view of the flimsy nature of the supporting evidence. The style is quite interesting though rather repetitive, but one unfortunate feature of the book is the lack of a bibliography. The index should be considerably more comprehensive. There are plenty of black and white drawings and over thirty photographic plates to illustrate the text.

Mr Cramp has obviously worked hard at his somewhat unconvincing thesis, but although failing to convert your humble servant to his way of thinking, is nevertheless to be congratulated for provoking a re-assessment of some aspects of physics.

---

#### MYSTERY MEN THREATEN UFO WITNESSES

It now seems that all these stories we hear about sinister characters threatening witnesses to significant UFO incidents are really true after all. The U.S. Air Force has now publicly disowned them, thus leaving open wide avenues of speculation as to exactly who they may be and what their mysterious purpose is. The following intriguing item appeared in the Sunday Telegraph on January 29th:-

-----  
Mysterious men dressed in Air Force uniforms or bearing impressive credentials from Government agencies have been trying to "silence" people who have seen unidentified flying objects (U.F.O.s or "flying saucers").

This was confirmed today (January 28th) by Col. George Freeman, the Pentagon spokesman for Project Bluebook, an Air Force

scheme to investigate all UFO reports.

A team of scientists will try to determine, once and for all, whether "flying saucers" are myth or reality.

The sudden appearance of unidentified people apparently trying to suppress information is an added mystery. "These men are not connected with the Air Force," said Col. Freeman.

He cited one case in which police officers and other witnesses at sightings in New Jersey were said to have been told by a man in Air Force uniform that they "hadn't seen anything" and should not discuss the incident.

"We checked with the local Air Force base," Col. Freeman said, "and discovered that no one connected with the Air Force had visited the area on that date."

Another man, bearing credentials from the North American Air Defence, saw Mr Rex Heflin, who had taken a series of pictures in California in 1965, and demanded the originals. Later, the defence body denied having anything to do with the incident. The photographs have never been returned.

In February, 1960, Mr Joe Perry, a restaurant owner in Grand Blanc, Michigan, took a similar set of pictures and was soon visited by two men posing as F.B.I. agents. They seized a photograph of a dome-shaped object with a green tail.

More recently, a man claiming to represent "a Government agency so secret that he couldn't give its name" questioned two boys at a school in Norwalk, Connecticut, about the disc-shaped object they said had pursued them last year.

"We haven't been able to find out anything about these men," Col. Freeman admitted. "We would sure like to catch one."

Many witnesses said they saw several Air Force helicopters manoeuvring over a New Jersey reservoir after a sighting last October. Col. Freeman said that no formation of helicopters had been in that area at the time.

#### RECENT LANDING REPORTS

Oklahoma, U.S.A.      near Moore      October 1966

Reports of a possible landing near Moore, Oklahoma, have been investigated by the Unidentified Aerial Phenomena Research Organization (UAPRO). The actual landing was not witnessed, but the date was thought to be in early October 1966. The initial investigation was conducted by a resident of Moore, Mrs Linda Gerstner, for the Oklahoma UFO Research Association.

Physical evidence consisted of a rough, 10 ft. circle of flattened vegetation. The plants, ragweed, were about 2 - 3 ft. high and had been flattened as if a heavy weight had rested on them. The ground was unbroken and no other physical traces were found. The location was a shallow ravine about 1 mile south of Moore.

Several witnesses had observed mysterious lights in the ravine on October 6th and 7th. One light was photographed and the picture showed a round ball of light very close to the ground. Also, a large, triangular UFO was seen in the vicinity on the night of October 7th, by two witnesses.

UAPRO regards this incident as a "probable" landing. (Credit: UAPRO and Belgian Interplanetary Studycircle)

COLORADO, U.S.A.      Daniels Park, Denver      April 7th, 1966

The date of this incident was wrongly given in the October, 1966, issue of MUFORG Bulletin as April 8th. The actual date was April 7th. The incident has been investigated by the Colorado State representative of UAPRO, Mr John Stevenson.

This investigation has revealed some rather strange aspects of the case. We quote from the report of the investigation published in a special issue of UAPRO Bulletin (Vol. 1., No. 4).

".... The group built a fire in the shelter and ate their



lunch.

"At approximately 6.45 p.m. they heard sounds outside the shelter. Mari Zolar and Don Otis decided to go out and look around. Don and Mari were outside the shelter-- and down the valley a small distance a "man" or "what had the shape of a man", was standing next to Mari. Mari evidently heard something as she turned the flashlight on the "man" (It should be emphasized that Mari only heard a sound and was shining the light in that direction, or where the others were seeing the "man" --Ed.), but she WAS UNABLE TO SEE HIM!!

"Patty Retherford and Kaye Hurley saw all of this from the shelter, but did not say anything to Don and Mari when they returned."

When the youths were leaving the park, they saw a UFO following their car, except for the driver, who looked in his rear-view mirror, but was unable to see it.  
(Credit: UAPRO)

---

### Moseley and NICAP

Mr James Moseley, editor of the American UFO magazine, "Saucer News", has been expelled from NICAP. A Committee has been formed with the objects of obtaining the restoration of his membership and an apology from NICAP officials. Apparently, the reason for his expulsion is that he published some criticisms of NICAP.

Anyone interested in this matter should write for further information to:- Donald R. Cook, Jr., 3648 Potomac Court, East Point, Georgia 30044, U.S.A.

---

### New UFO Magazine

A new UFO magazine with a popular appeal has appeared on the scene. It is the "Journal of UFO Worldwide." The editor is Michael Montgomery, 45 Turner Place, Great Horton, Bradford, Yorkshire. Subscription to the magazine is 16/- a year, including 6 Newsletters. There is also the UFO-Advertiser (6 issues, 3/6, giving details of UFO publications, etc., for sale or wanted.

---

### U.S. Fireball

On the night of February 15th, a flaming object shot through the sky for 45 minutes down the west coast of America before disappearing into the Pacific Ocean off Los Angeles.

The object was seen by thousands of people from Las Vegas to San Francisco. It appeared to be brightly coloured, possibly in flames, and left a blazing wake.

Mr Troy Norlander, an astronomer at Griffith Park Observatory, said the object was "definitely not a meteor."

Mr Horace Keane, the Federal Aviation Authority's regional duty officer in Los Angeles, said aircraft and ships 100 miles out to sea reported that a mysterious object passed overhead.

Later reports claimed that the object was a Russian booster rocket re-entering the earth's atmosphere.  
(Liverpool Echo - 16/2/67)

### M U F O R G   N E W S

Money At the Group's February meeting financial regulations were tightened up. In future, all items of expenditure on behalf of the Group must be submitted in writing to the Treasurer to be voted on at the next monthly meeting and, if approved, to be signed by the Chairman or Vice-Chairman before payment can be made. This will give all members a say in deciding how their subscriptions shall be spent.

Assistant Secretary The Group agreed to the appointment of an Assistant Secretary. Mr Stephen Davies was elected to this new office.

Bulletin At the February meeting the Chairman, Mr Harnwell, initiated a discussion on the comments on the BUFORA A.G.M. published in the December issue of MUFORG Bulletin, and asked members present for their opinions. Views expressed varied from outright condemnation to enthusiastic approval. No vote was taken. During the discussion it was pointed out that some MUFORG meetings would provide plenty of scope for "satirical" comments!

New Headquarters MUFORG now has its headquarters in rooms at 2, Alfred Place, Dingle, Liverpool, 8. These rooms are for the exclusive use of MUFORG and they have been redecorated, thanks to the hard work of several members. First meeting at the new HQ was held on February 22nd. Next meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 8th, at 8.0 p.m. Alfred Place is off Park Road, not far from the Dingle Bus Garage. Many buses pass nearby, including Nos. 20, 3, 82, 500 and H1.

---

## M U F O R G B u l l e t i n

EDITOR John Harney, 53 Woodyear Road, Bromborough, Wirral, Cheshire, England. Telephone EASTham 2146.

CONTRIBUTIONS Articles, comments, reviews, press cuttings welcome. When writing letters to the editor, please indicate if they are intended for publication. Contributions published in this Bulletin are the responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of MUFORG.

COPYRIGHT Any publication may freely reprint any original material contained in this Bulletin, unless otherwise stated, provided that a credit line is given to MUFORG Bulletin.

EXCHANGES Exchanges of your magazine or information welcomed. All exchange publications should be sent to the Editor. Correspondence about administrative matters concerning MUFORG should be sent, please, to the Hon. Secretary, R.D. Hughes, 86 Trouville Road, Liverpool, 4, and not to the Editor.

DISTRIBUTION MUFORG members and some UFO organisations in Britain, U.S.A. and Western Europe.

---

February 1967

W. J. H. 12/1

ALFRED PLACE  
DINGLE  
BULLETIN